

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

-----  
HAKEEM SULTAANA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ERIKA CUNLIFFE, *et al.*,

Defendants.  
-----

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

CASE NO. 1:18CV67

OPINON & ORDER

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Hakeem Sultaana has filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s May 9, 2018 order dismissing his case. (Doc. No. 31). He contends the Court erred in dismissing his complaint because the defendants were in “default” and because the Court incorrectly determined he did not allege plausible claims. He also objects to the Court’s characterization of his allegations. He contends he “did not claim in his COMPLAINT that ‘the original jury verdict forms in his trial were lost by the State Court Judge, and that he objected to the scanned version[s] that were provided for purposes of his appeal,’” as the Court stated. (*Id.* at 2.) Rather, he claims his complaint “revolves around the manufacturing of purported jury verdict forms that were supplemented in his direct appeal.” (*Id.*) He contends his complaint is sufficient to survive a dismissal and that the Court “must hold a default judgment hearing.” (*Id.* at 5.)

Reconsideration of a judgment is warranted only if there has been: (1) a clear error of law; (2) an intervening change in the law; (3) newly discovered evidence; or (4) a showing of manifest injustice. *Jones v. Gobbs*, 21 F. App’x 322, 323 (6th Cir. 2001), citing *GenCorp, Inc. v. American Int’l Underwriters*, 178 F.3d 804, 832 (6th Cir. 1999).

The Court does not find the plaintiff has demonstrated any circumstance warranting reconsideration of the Court's order dismissing his federal complaint pursuant to the Court's own review. The plaintiff's arguments do not alter the Court's conclusion that the plaintiff's federal claims, against a clerk of court and his defense lawyers, were properly dismissed. Further, the Court does not agree with the plaintiff that the defendants were in default and that he is entitled to a default hearing.

Accordingly, the plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is denied. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 22, 2018

s/ *James S. Gwin*  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE